



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/785,532	01/17/1997	JOE W. GRAY	2500.124US2	4124

22798 7590 03/11/2003

QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, P.C.
P O BOX 458
ALAMEDA, CA 94501

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DAVIS, MINH TAM B

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/785,532	GRAY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MINH-TAM DAVIS	1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 26-63 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-36,38-55 and 57-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 26-28,37,56 and 61-63 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: See Continuation Sheet .

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: courtesy copies of prior search reports in 1997.

DETAILED ACTION

Effective February 7, 1998, the Group Art Unit location has been changed, and the examiner of the application has been changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Minh-Tam Davis, Group Art Unit 1642.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/25/02 has been entered.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Accordingly, claims 26-28, 37, 56, 61-63, SEQ ID NO:9 are examined in the instant application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 26-28, 37, 56, 61-63 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph pertaining to the use of the language "relative" copy number in claim 26, for reasons already of record in paper No: 28.

Applicant argues that the term "relative copy number" is a term well known in the art, as shown in the paragraph on CGH microarrays obtained from a web site. Applicant

asserts that the term indicates simply that the measurement, while quantitative need not be an absolute measure of copy number.

The recitation of the paragraph on CGH microarrays is acknowledged.

Applicant's arguments in paper No: 33 have been considered but are found not persuasive for the following reasons:

It is noted that in the paragraph on CGH microarrays, the relative copy number in the test sample is recited as compared to the control sample (3rd page, first paragraph). In claim 26 however, it is not clear that the relative copy number of a nucleic acid in a sample is relative to what and/or is compared to what.

Further, there is no definition of the term "relative copy number" in the specification, nor in the CGH microarrays paragraph recited by Applicant.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

Claims 26-28, 56, 61-63 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph pertaining to lack of a clear written description, for reasons already of record in paper No: 28.

Applicant argues that Applicant were in possession of a probe which hybridizes to SEQ ID NO:9 under the stringent conditions recited in claim 26. Applicant asserts that the Examiner has offered no objective evidence that such numerous unrelated sequences would be detected in the assay.

Applicant's arguments in paper No: 33 have been considered but are found not persuasive for the following reasons:

The claims as written encompass a method for detecting the presence or absence of neoplastic cells having an increased copy number of nucleic acid sequences at chromosome region 20q13.2, using probes with unknown structure and length, provided said probes share a fragment with SEQ ID NO:9 and are capable of hybridizing to SEQ ID NO:9 via said common fragment under the stringent conditions recited in claim 26.

The specification and the claims lack information of the structure or function of the probes used for the claimed method, and thus do not meet the written description requirement.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, ENABLEMENT, NEW
REJECTION**

Claims 26-28, 37, 56, 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 26-28, 37, 56, 61-63 are drawn to a method of detecting in a sample the presence or absence of neoplastic cells having an increased copy number of nucleic acid sequences at chromosome region 20q13.2, comprising contacting a nucleic acid sample with a probe which hybridizes to SEQ ID NO:9, under the stringent conditions recited in claim 26, and detecting the formation of a hybridization complex to determine the relative copy number of a nucleic acid in the chromosome region 20q13.2, thereby

identifying the presence or absence of neoplastic cells having an increased copy number of nucleic acid sequences at the chromosomal region 20q13.2.

The specification discloses that using the minimal chromosomal region probe RMC20C001 which is within the chromosome region 20q13.2, an increased level of DNA amplification in the region encompassed by said probe is consistently detected in breast cancers (p.49-50). The specification also discloses that the RMC20C001 probe defines a region of 1.5 Mb within the chromosome region 20q13.2 (p.52, last paragraph). The specification further discloses that SEQ ID NO:9 represent the 2Kb promoter region of zinc finger amplified in breast cancer (ZABC-1), and that this gene maps to the core of the 20q13.2 amplicon and is overexpressed in primary tumors and breast cancer cell lines (p.21, lines 11-15).

No data however is found in the specification concerning the detection of an increased copy number of the gene comprising SEQ ID NO:9. Further, it is not clear whether overexpression of the gene comprising SEQ ID NO:9 is referred to gene amplification or RNA amplification, which are independent from each other .

One cannot extrapolate the teaching of the specification to the scope of the claims because although the 1.5 Mb RMC20C001 probe detect DNA amplification in this region, the RMC20C001 probe spans a very large region of 1.5 Mb which comprises numerous genes that are unrelated to the gene comprising SEQ ID NO:9, which comprises of only a 2Kb sequence, and because it is well known in the art that amplification or regulation of different genes is independent of each other. In other words, it is unpredictable which genes in the 1.5 Mb region are amplified and detected

by the RMC20C001 probe. Thus one cannot predict that detection of the presence of SEQ ID NO:9 in a sample would detect an increased copy number of the gene comprising SEQ ID NO:9, and it is not clear how the detection of the presence of SEQ ID NO:9 would determine the relative copy number of a nucleic acid in the chromosome region 20q13.2, and thereby indentifying the presence of neoplastic cells.

Further, no specific probes are recited in the claims for use in the detection of SEQ ID NO:8. One would have expected that using any probe, non-related nucleic acid sequences, which share some similarity with SEQ ID NO:9, could be detected, thus could effect the total level of DNA detected. For example, the claimed method would detect 1) a sequence which is 88% similar to SEQ ID NO:9, as taught by Morris et al, 1991 (MPSRCH search report, 1997, us-08-731-499-05.rge, pages 1-2, of record, a courtesy copy of which is enclosed) 2) a sequence which is 84% similar to SEQ ID NO:9, as taught by Ionov Y et al, 1994 (MPSRCH search report, 1997, us-08-731-499-01.rng, page 2, of record, a courtesy copy of which is enclosed) and 3) a sequence which is 77% similar to SEQ ID NO:9, as taught by Beach DH et al, 1993 (MPSRCH search report, 1997, us-08-731-499-01.rng, pages 1-2, of record, a courtesy copy of which is enclosed), wherein these unrelated sequences are not necessarily amplified. In other words, using any probe, it is unpredictable that one could detect an increase in the gene copy of SEQ ID NO:9 in cancer as compared to normal control, due to possible interference by other unrelated sequences that are also detected.

In view of the above, it would have been undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention as broadly as claimed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, SCOPE

1. If Applicant could overcome the above 112, first paragraph rejection, claims 26-28, 56, 61-63 are still rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, pertaining to lack of enablement for a method for detecting the presence or absence of "any neoplastic cell" having an increased number of "any nucleic acid sequence" at chromosome region 20q13.2, for reasons already of record in paper No: 28.

Applicant argues that that the Examiner implicitly reads a limitation into the claims that is not present. Applicant asserts that the language "any neoplastic cells" or "any nucleic acid sequences" does not exist in claim 26, and invites the Examiner to identify the language "any neoplastic cells" or "any nucleic acid sequences" in claim 26.

Applicant asserts that genes other than those identified in the present claims may also be amplified at 20q13.2 in neoplastic cells is simply irrelevant to enablement of the claimed invention.

Applicant asserts that the Examiner has provided no objective basis to support an allegation that performing the presently claimed method will fail to identify amplifications at 20q13.2 in a sample containing cells having such amplification.

Applicant's arguments in paper No: 33 have been considered but are found not persuasive for the following reasons:

It is noted that the language "any neoplastic cells" or "any nucleic acid sequences" does not have to be in the claim 26 for the claim 26 to be reasonably interpreted as encompassing a method for detecting the presence or absence of "any

neoplastic cell" having an increased number of "any nucleic acid sequence" at chromosomal region 20q13.2, by detecting the hybridization of a probe with SEQ ID NO:9, wherein detecting the formation of a hybridization complex would determine the relative copy number of "any nucleic acid" in chromosomal region 20q13.2, thereby indentifying the presence or absence of any neoplastic cells having an increased copy number of "any nucleic acid sequence" at chromosomal region 20q13.2.

One cannot extrapolate from one example of detection of breast cancer, in which SEQ ID NO:9 is overexpressed, to detection of any cancer having increased copy of number of a nucleic acid sequence which is unrelated to SEQ ID NO:9, provided said nucleic acid sequence is within the chromosome region 20q13.2, because using a probe specific for SEQ ID NO:9 one would not expect to detect other sequences that are structurally unrelated to SEQ ID NO:9, but are within the chromosome region 20q13.2. Further, although breast cancer has overexpression of SEQ ID NO:9, it is unpredictable that any other neoplastic cell that has an increased copy number of nucleic acid sequences at chromosome region 20q13.2, wherein said nucleic acid sequences are different than SEQ ID NO:9, would also have an increased copy number of SEQ ID NO:9, because different cancers have different etiology, and mechanisms of carcinogenesis, and because the role of SEQ ID NO:9 in any cancer development is not known.

2. If Applicant could overcome the above 112, first paragraph rejection, claims 26-28, 56, 61-63 are still rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph pertaining to lack of enablement for a method for detecting in "any sample", the presence or absence of

neoplastic cells having an increased number of nucleic acid sequences at chromosome region 20q13.2, for reasons already of record in paper No: 28.

Applicant argues that in a sample lacking neoplastic cells with an amplification at 20q13.2, the assay will be negative, i.e. the assay will report the absence of neoplastic cells in the subject sample as recited in the preamble of the claim.

Applicant's arguments in paper No: 33 have been considered but are found not persuasive for the following reasons:

The claims encompass a method for detecting the presence of neoplastic cells in any sample. However, it is unpredictable that any cancer sample, or any cancer tissue would have an increased copy of SEQ ID NO:9, because different cancers have different etiology, and mechanisms of carcinogenesis, and because the role of SEQ ID NO:9 in any cancer development is not known.

Further, there is no use for the claimed detection of the absence of neoplastic cells in a sample, e.g. in a hair sample.

In view of the above, it would have been undue experimentation to practice the claimed invention as broadly as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH-TAM DAVIS whose telephone number is 703-305-2008. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ANTHONY CAPUTA can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0916.

MINH TAM DAVIS

February 4, 2003


ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

RESULT 2

ID Q31880 standard; DNA: 3158 BP.

AC Q31880; 173 AAAATAACAAAATTAAGCIGGGCATGGTAATAACACCTGTAACTCCAGCTTTGGAA 114

DT 22-APR-1993 (first entry)

DE Cyclin D3 Promoter.

KW Cyclin; D1; D2; D3; Promoter; human; liver; genomic library; Clone;

KW upstream; exon; 1; Intron; neural; PCYC1-H11; mutant; yeast; strain;

KW CLN; cyclin; gene; CLN 1; CLN 2; human; glioblastoma; cDNA library;

KW expression vector; PADNS; transformant; PCYCD1-21; PCYCD1-19; HeLa;

OS 88.

OS Homo sapiens.

PN P0220796-A.

PD 26-NOV-1992.

PF 18-MAY-1992; U04146.

PR 16-MAY-1991; US-01514.

PA (COLD) COLD SPRING HARBOR LAB.

PI Beach DH.

DR WP; 92-41574/50.

PT Recombinant mammalian D-type cyclin - replaces a CLN-type protein

PT essential for cell start in budding yeast, its antibodies and

PT probes being useful in detecting D-type cyclin in biological

PS samples.

PS Disclosure: Fig 1.3: 75PP; English.

CC The sequences given in Q31878-80 represents the cyclin D1 to D3

CC promoters. These sequences were identified during the isolation of

CC the D-type cyclin cDNAs from a normal human liver genomic library.

CC A mutant yeast strain in which two of the three CLN cyclin genes

CC (CLN 1 and CLN 2) were inactivated and expression of the third was

CC conditional, was used to identify human cDNA clones that rescue yeast

CC from CLN deficiency. A human glioblastoma cDNA library carried in a

CC yeast expression vector (pADNS) was introduced into a mutant yeast

CC strain. Two yeast transformants (pcYCD1-21 and pcYCD1-19) which grew

CC despite the lack of function of all three CLN genes and were not

CC revertants, were identified and recovered in E. coli. These two

CC clones were shown to be independent clone representing the same gene.

CC A HeLa cDNA library was screen for a full length cDNA clone using the

CC 1.2 kb insert of PCYCD1-21 as a probe. The sequence isolated by this

CC method was PCYCD1-H12 (see also Q31873). Degenerate probes and

CC primers were designed using the D1 gene sequence. These primers

CC and probes were used in the isolation of the cyclin D2 and D3 genes.

CC See also Q31874-5. The cyclin D1 cDNA clone was used to screen a

CC liver genomic library resulting in the identification of three

CC positive clones. These clones were shown to correspond to the

CC upstream promoter region and a 198 bp exon, followed by an intron of

CC cyclin D1. Human cyclin promoters D2 and D3 were isolated in the same

CC manner. Cyclin D1 has been shown to be expressed differentially in

CC different cell types, with expression being highest in cells of neural

CC origin.

Sequence 3158 BP; 952 A; 674 C; 722 G; 810 T;

Query Match 6.8%; Score 135; DB 5; Length 315B;

Best Local Similarity 77.0%; Pred. No. 1.64e-8; Mismatches 62; Indels 4; Gaps 2;

Matches 221; Conservative 0; N mismatches 62;

ID Q94109 standard; DNA: 7849 BP.

AC Q94109; 173 AAAATAACAAAATTAAGCIGGGCATGGTAATAACACCTGTAACTCCAGCTTTGGAA 114

DT 22-FEB-1996 (first entry)

DE Human; thrombopoietin; TPO; mpl ligand; hml; fragment polypeptide;

KW megakaryocytopoietic cytokine receptor; thrombopoietic signal;

KW EPO-domain fragment; erythropoietin; hepo; haemopoietic cell;

KW megakaryocyte; thrombocytopenia; myeloproliferative disease;

KW inflammatory thrombocytopenia; iron deficiency; EPO; platelet;

OS Homo sapiens.

FN Location/Qualifiers

FT Print transcript 1166..7289

FT /**transcript a

FT exon 1161..1232